DUKE-CGTP-99-03

hep-th/9902116

arXiv:hep-th/9902116v1 16 Feb 1999

D-Branes, Derived Categories, and Grothendieck Groups

Eric Sharpe
Department of Physics
Box 90305
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708
ersharpe@cgtp.duke.edu

In this paper we describe how Grothendieck groups of coherent sheaves and locally free sheaves can be used to describe type II D-branes, in the case that all D-branes are wrapped on complex varieties and all connections are holomorphic. Our proposal is in the same spirit as recent discussions of K-theory and D-branes; within the restricted class mentioned, Grothendieck groups encode a choice of connection on each D-brane worldvolume, in addition to information about the C^∞ bundles. We also point out that derived categories can also be used to give insight into D-brane constructions, and analyze how a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subset of the T-duality group acting on D-branes on tori can be understood in terms of a Fourier-Mukai transformation.

February 1999

1 Introduction

Recently it was noted that topological K-theory can be usefully employed to describe D-brane charges [1]. In this paper we shall introduce new technical tools which give a refinement of K-theory (more precisely, a holomorphic version of K theory), at the cost of less general applicability. As an example of their application, we will apply these tools to a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of T-duality (identified with a Fourier-Mukai transform) and show how these tools can be used to understand Fourier-Mukai transforms beyond the subclass of sheaves usually considered in the physics literature.

It has been observed elsewhere (for example, [2, 3]) that branes supported on complex submanifolds of complex varieties are naturally described in terms of coherent sheaves. We shall describe how Grothendieck groups of coherent sheaves, the holomorphic version of K-theory referred to above, can be used to describe D-branes, in the case that all D-branes are wrapped on complex submanifolds. Since we ultimately wish to study T-duality realized as a Fourier-Mukai transform, and Fourier-Mukai transforms are defined, in general, on derived categories, not individual sheaves, we shall also discuss derived categories. In particular, we shall point out a physical interpretation of objects of a derived category, and give a physically-motivated map from objects of a derived category to Grothendieck group elements. We conclude with a discussion of T-duality symmetries in terms of Fourier-Mukai transforms. In particular, we shall examine how Grothendieck groups can be used to extend the action of Fourier-Mukai transforms beyond the class of W.I.T. sheaves considered previously in the physics literature. For completeness, we have also included a short appendix on the basics of topological K-theory. We suspect the application of these technical tools may have much broader applicability (to the study of Kontsevich's mirror conjecture, for example), but unfortunately we shall have little to say on such extensions.

We shall only consider D-branes in type II theories, which are described by the K-theory of complex vector bundles [1]. We will not usually work with space-filling D-branes, and so we shall not concern ourselves with tadpole-cancellation issues.

In [1] it was noted that branes can only consistently wrap a submanifold when the normal bundle to the submanifold admits a Spin^c structure. In this paper we will only work in complex geometry, and as all $U(N)$ bundles admit a canonical Spin^c structure [4, appendix D], we shall never have to consider this subtlety in this paper. (For a more thorough discussion of the Spin^c constraint in the context of type II compactifications with vanishing cosmological constant, see [5].)

We shall assume throughout this paper that all varieties are smooth and projective. (For example, all complex tori appearing will implicitly be assumed to be abelian varieties.)

Since the publication of [1], several other papers have appeared on topological K theory and D-branes [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. We should also mention that the work [1] built upon the earlier

works [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. We have also been informed that another discussion of T-duality in the context of K-theory will appear in [16]. Also, as this paper was being finalized, another paper on T-duality and K-theory appeared [17].

2 Grothendieck groups

It has recently been argued by E. Witten that D-brane charges should be understood in terms of topological K-theory [1]. In this paper, we shall argue that in certain cases it is more useful to work with Grothendieck groups of coherent sheaves. In this particular section we shall define Grothendieck groups, then in later sections we shall show their relation to derived categories and describe how they can give insight into a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of T-duality realized as a Fourier-Mukai transformation.

In this paper we shall only work on complex varieties, and will only wrap branes on (complex) subvarieties. This constraint reduces us to a proper subset of all possible D-brane configurations, but by making this restriction we will be able to use more powerful tools. For example, in these circumstances we can make some strong statements concerning supersymmetric vacuum configurations of a D-brane [2, section 4.2]. Consider a set of N branes on some Kähler variety of dimension n. If F is the curvature of the connection on the $U(N)$ bundle, and J the Kähler form, then in order to get a supersymmetric vacuum some necessary conditions[1] on F are [2, section 4.2]

$$F \in \Omega^{1,1} \tag{1}$$

$$F \wedge J^{n-1} = \lambda J^n \tag{2}$$

for some constant λ.

Given a C^∞ bundle $\mathcal{E}$ (with a fixed Hermitian structure) on a complex manifold, there is a one-to-one correspondence between connections D_A on $\mathcal{E}$ that satisfy equation (1) (in other words, holomorphic connections) and holomorphic structures on $\mathcal{E}$ [18, section VII.1]. Thus, specifying a bundle with a fixed holomorphic structure is equivalent to specifying a C^∞ bundle with a choice of holomorphic connection. (If in addition the holomorphic connection satisfies equation (2), then the corresponding holomorphic bundle will be Mumford-Takemoto semistable.)

Thus, within the context of the restriction to complex subvarieties and holomorphic bundles, the specification of a holomorphic bundle on some subvariety is equivalent to specifying a complex C^∞ bundle together with a choice of holomorphic connection on the bundle – data associated with a D-brane.

[1] The attentive reader will note that these are almost, but not quite, two necessary conditions for supersymmetric heterotic vacua.

Instead of working with topological K theory, which only encodes C^∞ bundles, it can be advantageous to work with a "holomorphic" version of K-theory, which implicitly encodes not only choices of C^∞ bundles, but also specific choices of (holomorphic) connections on the bundles. Such a holomorphic version of topological K-theory exists, and is known as a Grothendieck group (of locally free sheaves).

Before we actually define Grothendieck groups, we need to make some general observations. The motivation given above for working with Grothendieck groups is clearly rather weak, but in later sections we shall give stronger arguments. We pointed out that the conditions for a supersymmetric D-brane vacuum on a complex Kähler manifold imply that the connection on the C^∞ bundle is holomorphic, and so the combined C^∞ bundle plus connection can be described equivalently in terms of a holomorphic bundle. However, when we start working with configurations of both branes and antibranes, we should not expect conditions for a supersymmetric vacuum to be of great relevance, and so it is not completely clear from this description that Grothendieck groups are necessarily useful objects. We shall see later that working with Grothendieck groups give us a natural arena in which to examine T-duality, for example, so by working with Grothendieck groups we do get some useful insights.

Before defining Grothendieck groups, another technical observation should be made. In order to specify a supersymmetric vacuum for a D-brane, we must specify not just any holomorphic connection, but one which is Hermitian-Einstein (equation (2)). Thus, to specify a supersymmetric vacuum, not any holomorphic bundle will do, but only those which are Mumford-Takemoto semistable. Note this means that given a general element of the Grothendieck group, there is not one but two reasons why it will not describe a supersymmetric vacuum – not only because of the simultaneous presence of branes and antibranes, but also because the (holomorphic) bundles are not necessarily Mumford-Takemoto semistable.

Strictly speaking there are two distinct Grothendieck groups relevant here, which we shall denote $K'^0(X)$ and $K'_0(X)$ [19, 20]. We shall first define both, then point out that in reasonably nice circumstances they are isomorphic. To distinguish Grothendieck groups from topological K-theory, we shall use $K'(X)$ to denote Grothendieck groups and $K(X)$ to denote topological K-theory.

The Grothendieck group $K'_0(X)$ of coherent sheaves is defined to be the free abelian group on coherent sheaves on X, modulo elements $\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}' - \mathcal{E}''$, where $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}'$, and $\mathcal{E}''$ are coherent sheaves related by short exact sequences of the form

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}'' \to \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}' \to 0$$

The Grothendieck group $K'^0(X)$ of locally free sheaves is defined to be the free abelian group on locally free sheaves on X, modulo elements $\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}' - \mathcal{E}''$, where $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}'$, and $\mathcal{E}''$ are

locally free sheaves related by short exact sequences of the form

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}'' \to \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}' \to 0$$

More formally [19, prop. 4.4], K'^0 is a contravariant functor from the category of noetherian schemes to the category of rings. Note in passing that these definitions of K_0' and K'^0 are closely analogous to the definition of topological K^0.

For further information on Grothendieck groups (and their relation to derived categories, which shall appear shortly), see for example [19, 20].

It can be shown ([19],[22, exercise III.6.9]) that on a smooth projective variety X, the natural map $K'^0(X) \to K_0'(X)$ is an isomorphism. In the rest of this paper we shall assume that we are always working on a smooth projective variety, and so we shall use K'^0 and K_0' more or less interchangeably. We shall also often refer to "the" Grothendieck group.

The reader may wonder how precisely Grothendieck groups are related to topological K-theory. In order to get some insight into the relation between these objects, let us consider an example. Suppose X is a smooth compact Riemann surface. It is straightforward to compute[2] that topological $K^0(X) = \mathbf{Z}^{\oplus 2}$. By contrast [22, exercise II.6.11], the Grothendieck group $K_0'(X) = \text{Pic } X \oplus \mathbf{Z}$. Although the topological K-theory groups and Grothendieck groups are not identical, they are still closely related. Note for example that for X a smooth Riemann surface, Pic X is an extension of $\mathbf{Z}$ by Jac X, so the Grothendieck group $K_0'(X) = \text{Pic } X \oplus \mathbf{Z}$ includes the topological K-theory group $K^0(X) = \mathbf{Z} \oplus \mathbf{Z}$ as a subset. In other words, in this example the Grothendieck group contains more information than topological K^0. This certainly agrees with the intuition we laid earlier – the Grothendieck group should contain information not only about the choice of C^∞ bundle, but also about the precise choice of connection on that bundle.

In general it is easy to see that the Grothendieck group K'^0 maps into topological K^0. Unfortunately in general this map will not be surjective. One can certainly map a locally free sheaf to a smooth bundle, essentially just by forgetting the holomorphic structure. The attentive reader might be concerned that this map is not well-defined – in the definition of K'^0, $\mathcal{E}$ is identified with $\mathcal{E}' \oplus \mathcal{E}''$ if $\mathcal{E}$ is an extension of either $\mathcal{E}'$ or $\mathcal{E}''$ by the other, whereas in topological K^0 we only identify split extensions. However, it is a standard fact that any extension of continuous vector bundles splits [23, section 3.9] (whereas not every extension of holomorphic bundles splits holomorphically), so in fact the obvious map $K'^0 \to K^0$ is well-defined. Unfortunately in general this map will not be surjective. One way to see this is to note that Chern classes of a holomorphic bundle on a projective variety X live only in a subset of $H^*(X, \mathbf{Z})$ – in particular, $c_i \in H^{(i,i)}(X) \cap H^{2i}(X, \mathbf{Z})$ – whereas Chern classes of an arbitrary C^∞ complex bundle are not so restricted.

In topological K-theory, one can define K^1 in addition to K^0. There are also holomorphic

[2]Using the Atiyah-Hirzebruch spectral sequence. See [21, section 2].

versions of K^1, though they are rather more obscure [24, chapter 13]. We shall not use these holomorphic versions of K^1, though for completeness we list them here.

Define [24, chapter 13] $K'_1(X)$ to be the free abelian group on pairs $(\mathcal{E}, \rho)$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is a coherent sheaf on X and $\rho : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism, modulo elements $(\mathcal{E}, \rho) - (\mathcal{E}', \rho') - (\mathcal{E}'', \rho'')$ where $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}'$, and $\mathcal{E}''$ are coherent sheaves related by short exact sequences of the form

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}'' \to \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}' \to 0$$

and also modulo $(\mathcal{E}, \rho \circ \psi) - (\mathcal{E}, \rho) - (\mathcal{E}, \psi)$.

Define [24, chapter 13] $K'^1(X)$ analogously to $K'_1(X)$, that is, to be the free abelian group on pairs $(\mathcal{E}, \rho)$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free sheaf on X and $\rho : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism, modulo elements $(\mathcal{E}, \rho) - (\mathcal{E}', \rho') - (\mathcal{E}'', \rho'')$ where $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}'$, and $\mathcal{E}''$ are locally free sheaves related by short exact sequences of the form

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}'' \to \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}' \to 0$$

and also modulo $(\mathcal{E}, \rho \circ \psi) - (\mathcal{E}, \rho) - (\mathcal{E}, \psi)$.

In passing, note that these definitions are closely analogous to a definition of topological K^1 used recently in, for example, [6].

3 Derived categories

Ultimately in this paper we would like to study the action of T-duality (realized as a Fourier-Mukai transform) on brane/antibrane configurations. However, Fourier-Mukai transforms are defined on derived categories of coherent sheaves, not individual sheaves, in general. In special cases[3] one can make sense out of the action of a Fourier-Mukai transform on an individual sheaf, however to discuss Fourier-Mukai transforms in generality, one must turn to derived categories.

Because of our interest in T-duality, we shall now discuss derived categories and their physical relevance. In particular, we shall show how an element of a Grothendieck group can be obtained from an object in a derived category (in a physically meaningful manner). In the next section, we shall put this map to use in studying T-duality in terms of Fourier-Mukai transformations. As usual, we shall be implicitly working over complex varieties and with holomorphic bundles, and so we shall also assume that all tachyons, viewed as bundle maps, are also complex and holomorphic.

[3]Indeed, previously in the physics literature authors have only considered these special cases when discussing Fourier-Mukai transforms.

Recall from [1] that given a coincident brane, anti-brane pair, with bundles $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ respectively, and a tachyon field $T : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$, then the resulting brane charge one would actually be left with in vacuum is (at least morally) the Grothendieck group element given by $\ker T \ominus \text{coker } T$, or equivalently $H^0 \ominus H^1$, where the H^i are the cohomology of the complex

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{T} \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0$$

(Note that since we are working in complex geometry, $\ker T$ and $\text{coker } T$ make sense as sheaves[4].)

One can also imagine working with more general complexes of bundles. These would be described as a sandwich of alternating branes and anti-branes. For example, let $\mathcal{F}^\bullet$ denote a complex of bundles

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{T_{i-1}} \mathcal{F}^i \xrightarrow{T_i} \mathcal{F}^{i+1} \xrightarrow{T_{i+1}} \mathcal{F}^{i+2} \xrightarrow{T_{i+2}} \cdots$$

(where, by definition of complex[5], $T_{j+1} \circ T_j = 0$) such that the $\mathcal{F}^{2i}$ all live on (coincident) branes and the $\mathcal{F}^{2i+1}$ all live on (coincident) anti-branes. Put another way, the total sheaf on the brane is

$$\bigoplus_n \mathcal{F}^{2n} \tag{3}$$

and the total sheaf on the antibrane is

$$\bigoplus_n \mathcal{F}^{2n+1} \tag{4}$$

with the tachyon potential broken up into an interweaving series of maps between the brane and antibrane. After cancelling as much as possible, one is left with an element of $K_0'(X)$ given by

$$\left[\bigoplus_n H^{2n}\right] \ominus \left[\bigoplus_n H^{2n+1}\right]$$

Clearly such a complex encodes a lot of physically-irrelevant information. Indeed, the complex $\mathcal{F}^\bullet$ described above is physically identical to the complex

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{0} H^{j-1} \xrightarrow{0} H^j \xrightarrow{0} H^{j+1} \xrightarrow{0} \cdots$$

and even the complex

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_n H^{2n} \xrightarrow{0} \bigoplus_n H^{2n+1} \longrightarrow 0$$

The only physically relevant aspect of the complex is its image in the Grothendieck group.

[4] A technical note: we shall implicitly restrict to complexes whose cohomology sheaves are coherent.

[5] Note that, for example, $T_{2j+1} \circ T_{2j}$ is a map from the total sheaf on the brane (equation (3)) back into itself, whereas tachyons should only map branes to antibranes and vice-versa. Thus, in order to consistently break up the tachyon between the total brane (3) and antibrane (4) into an interweaving series of maps, as will be mentioned shortly, we must demand that $T_{j+1} \circ T_j = 0$, i.e., that the maps define a complex.

Although the only physically relevant aspect of a complex of branes and anti-branes is its Grothendieck-group image, we shall nevertheless find it useful to work in terms of complexes in the next section.

Since we are working in algebraic geometry, the attentive reader may wonder why we are restricting to locally free sheaves, rather than considering general coherent sheaves. For example, we could identify a torsion sheaf with a lower-dimensional D-brane. The difficulty is that we wish to speak of maps between the worldvolumes described by tachyons, and although open strings connecting branes and antibranes of the same dimension certainly contain tachyon modes, open strings connecting branes and antibranes of distinct dimension need not contain tachyon modes – whether a tachyon is actually present varies from case to case. Thus, we are restricting to locally free sheaves on worldvolumes all of the same dimension.

There exists a useful mechanism for working with complexes of holomorphic bundles, and more generally, holomorphic sheaves. This tool is known as a derived category.

A derived category of coherent sheaves on some variety X is a category whose objects are complexes of sheaves on X, such that the cohomology sheaves of the complexes are coherent. A derived category of (bounded complexes of) sheaves on X is denoted $D^b(X)$. The subcategory defined by complexes of sheaves with coherent cohomology is denoted $D^b_c(X)$. In general, not all derived categories are derived categories of sheaves; however, all the derived categories we shall describe in this paper are derived categories of sheaves.

A proper explanation of derived categories is well beyond the scope of this paper – for more information, see for example [25, 26]. However we shall mention one useful fact in passing. Morphisms of chain complexes that preserve cohomology (so-called quasi-isomorphisms) descend to isomorphisms in the derived category, so intuitively the reader might, very loosely[6], imagine that any two complexes in the derived category with isomorphic cohomology groups are themselves considered isomorphic.

It has been speculated previously in the physics literature that derived categories were relevant for physics [27, 28, 29]. In the context of holomorphic bundles, we now have an explicit correspondence.

Note that derived categories, just like complexes, contain a great deal of physically irrelevant information. We do not need to know the full cohomology of a complex of sheaves, but only the formal difference

$$\left(\bigoplus_n H^{2n}\right) \ominus \left(\bigoplus_n H^{2n+1}\right)$$

In other words, the only physically relevant part of an object in a derived category is its

[6]Technically this is incorrect; however, for those readers unwilling to delve into technicalities, this description does give some handle on matters.

image in the Grothendieck group of coherent sheaves.

The attentive reader should be slightly bothered by our use of derived categories to describe sandwiches of branes and antibranes. In these brane/antibrane sandwiches, we implicitly assumed that all the branes and antibranes were of the same dimension (equivalently, that we had a locally free sheaf on the worldvolume of each). By contrast, the objects of a derived category are complexes of more or less arbitrary sheaves, whose cohomology groups are coherent sheaves. Naively, it would seem that our brane/antibrane sandwich construction can only sense a small portion of the possible objects of a derived category.

However, this is not the case. Any bounded complex of coherent sheaves on a smooth variety is quasi-isomorphic to a bounded complex of locally free sheaves, that is, admits a chain map to a complex of locally free sheaves such that the chain map preserves the cohomology of the complex. (This is known formally as a Cartan-Eilenberg resolution of the complex [25, section 5.7].) Since quasi-isomorphisms descend to isomorphisms in the derived category, we see that any complex of coherent sheaves is isomorphic (within the derived category) to a complex of locally free sheaves.

There is one further technical problem that might bother the attentive reader. We have just argued that any complex of coherent sheaves can be equivalently described by a complex of locally free sheaves, and so in terms of a brane/antibrane sandwich. However, the objects of a derived category are not precisely complexes of coherent sheaves, but rather complexes of sheaves whose cohomology sheaves are coherent. In the special case of sheaves on smooth projective varieties, we strongly suspect that the two categories are equivalent, but we do not have a rigorous argument to support that claim.

4 T-duality

Now that we have introduced relevant technical machinery, we shall discuss T-duality. It is often said that a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of T-duality is realized via Fourier-Mukai transforms [3], and in the present context we shall find a natural setting for this ansatz. We shall begin by giving a physical motivation for the identification of a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of T-duality with a Fourier-Mukai transform, then go through a number of technical results on Fourier-Mukai transforms, and finally conclude with a discussion of why precisely one needs Grothendieck groups and derived categories to discuss Fourier-Mukai transforms on general D-brane configurations.

4.1 Physical motivation

Before we begin discussing Fourier-Mukai transforms in technical detail, we shall discuss in a pair of examples why precisely it is sometimes claimed [3] that a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of the

T-duality group acting on branes wrapped on complex algebraic tori is realized as a Fourier-Mukai transform. Note that for D-branes wrapped on T^{2g}, when we speak of T-duality we mean, T-duality along each of $2g$ S^1's in T^{2g}. Since we have T-dualized an even number of times, we will always take type IIA back to type IIA, and type IIB back to type IIB.

1) Consider a rank N bundle on T^2, with $c_1 = 0$ – in other words, an $SU(N)$ bundle on T^2. This precisely corresponds to N Dp-branes wrapped on T^2, with no immersed $D(p-2)$-brane charge. One expects that T-duality should map this to a configuration of N $D(p-2)$-branes, with support only at points on $\hat{T}^2$.

Indeed, this is precisely what we find. For reasonably nice[7] $SU(N)$ bundles $\mathcal{E}$ on T^2, the Fourier-Mukai transform is a skyscraper sheaf on $\hat{T}^2$, supported at points.

2) Consider a rank N bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on T^4 – in other words, a $U(N)$ bundle on T^4. This precisely corresponds to N Dp-branes wrapped on T^4, with immersed $D(p-2)$-brane charge $c_1(\mathcal{E})$, and with $D(p-4)$-brane charge given by $ch_2(\mathcal{E}) = c_2(\mathcal{E}) - (1/2)c_1(\mathcal{E})^2$. Under T-duality we expect $D(p-4)$-brane charge[8] on T^4 to become Dp-branes wrapped $\hat{T}^4$, and Dp-branes wrapping T^4 to become $D(p-4)$-brane charge on $\hat{T}^4$. Thus, we expect the T-dual to this configuration to be another bundle $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ on the dual T^4, of rank $ch_2(\mathcal{E})$, and $ch_2(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \text{rank } \mathcal{E}$.

Indeed, this is precisely what we find. For reasonably nice[9] bundles $\mathcal{E}$ on T^4, the dual is a bundle $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ of[10]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank } \hat{\mathcal{E}} &= ch_2(\mathcal{E}) \\ &= c_2(\mathcal{E}) - (1/2)c_1(\mathcal{E})^2 \\ c_1(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) &= \sigma(\, c_1(\mathcal{E})\,) \\ ch_2(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) &= \text{rank } \mathcal{E} \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma : H^2(T^4, \mathbf{Z}) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^2(\hat{T}^4, \mathbf{Z})$ is an isomorphism.

Thus, at least in these two examples, the usual claim [3] that T-duality of branes is realized by Fourier-Mukai transform seems to check out.

In discussions of Fourier-Mukai transforms in the physics literature, a single sheaf is mapped to a single sheaf. This is not the most general way that Fourier-Mukai transforms act; it is also not the most natural. In general, Fourier-Mukai transforms act on derived

[7] In notation to be defined shortly, W.I.T.$_1$.

[8] A small clarification is in order. Given some Dp-brane, there are two ways to get, say, $D(p-4)$-brane charge: (i) add a $D(p-4)$-brane (add a torsion sheaf, in more algebraic language), and (ii) modify ch_2 of the bundle on the Dp-brane worldvolume. More globally one expects the moduli space to be more or less reducible, with these options corresponding to distinct components. For simplicity we only discuss option (ii) in the example above.

[9] In notation to be defined shortly, W.I.T.$_1$.

[10] The equations shown correct typographical errors in equation (3.2.16) of [30]. We would like to thank Kentaro Hori for pointing out these errors to us.

categories of coherent sheaves, that is, they act on complexes of sheaves. One can act on a single sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ by using the trivial complex

$$0 \to \mathcal{E} \to 0$$

but in general the Fourier-Mukai transform will not be another trivial complex, but a much more complicated complex. In the next section we shall give the general technical definition of a Fourier-Mukai transform, then describe the special cases in which it has a well-defined action on individual coherent sheaves.

4.2 Technical definitions

Let X and $\hat{X}$ be projective varieties (not necessarily tori, for the moment). A Fourier-Mukai transform is a functor $\mathcal{T}$ between (in fact, an equivalence of) the derived categories $D^b(X)$ and $D^b(\hat{X})$. More precisely, if $\pi_1 : X \times \hat{X} \to X$ and $\pi_2 : X \times \hat{X} \to \hat{X}$ are the obvious projections, then for any $\mathcal{P} \in \mathrm{Ob}\ D^b(X \times \hat{X})$, we can define a Fourier-Mukai functor[11] [31]

$$\underline{R}\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathbf{L}}{\otimes} \pi_1^* -\right) : D^b(X) \to D^b(\hat{X}) \tag{5}$$

In the special case that $\mathcal{P}$ is a locally free sheaf on $X \times X'$ (the only case we shall consider), the Fourier-Mukai functor simplifies to become the right-derived functor[12]

$$\underline{R}\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^* -) : D^b(X) \to D^b(\hat{X}) \tag{6}$$

We shall denote this functor by $\mathcal{T} : D^b(X) \to D^b(\hat{X})$, and we shall usually restrict to $D^b_c(X)$ and $D^b_c(\hat{X})$.

In the remainder of this section, we shall specialize to the case that X and $\hat{X}$ are dual projective complex tori, and that $\mathcal{P}$ is the Poincare bundle on $X \times \hat{X}$.

Although Fourier-Mukai transforms are defined on derived categories, that is, on complexes of sheaves, there is a way to make sense out of their action on individual sheaves in special cases, and this is the specialization usually invoked in the physics literature. First, note that given any coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E}$, we can define the trivial complex

$$0 \to \mathcal{E} \to 0 \tag{7}$$

[11] In general, any equivalence of derived categories $D^b(X)$ and $D^b(\hat{X})$ for any smooth projective varieties X and $\hat{X}$ can be written in the form of equation (5) for some $\mathcal{P} \in \mathrm{Ob}\ D^b(X \times \hat{X})$ [32].

[12] As an aside, it is perhaps worth mentioning that conditions for a locally free sheaf $\mathcal{P}$ to define an equivalence of categories via equation (6) are known [33]. The locally free sheaf $\mathcal{P}$ defines an equivalence of categories via equation (6) precisely when for all points $x \in X$, $\mathcal{P}_x$ is simple, $\mathcal{P}_x = \mathcal{P}_x \otimes \omega_{\hat{X}}$ (where $\omega_{\hat{X}}$ is the dualizing sheaf on $\hat{X}$), and for any two distinct points x_1, x_2 of X and any integer i, one has $\mathrm{Ext}^i_{\hat{X}}(\mathcal{P}_{x_1}, \mathcal{P}_{x_2}) = 0$ [33].

thus we can map individual coherent sheaves into the class of objects of a derived category. We say a coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ is W.I.T.$_n$ if [31]

$$R^i\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P}\otimes\pi_1^*\mathcal{E}\right) \;=\; 0$$

for all i except $i=n$. Then, the Fourier-Mukai transform of a sheaf $\mathcal{E}$, identified with an object of the derived category via the trivial complex (7), is another sheaf (also defined via (7)), given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}} \;=\; R^n\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P}\otimes\pi_1^*\mathcal{E}\right)$$

Moreover, it can be shown that if $\mathcal{E}$ is W.I.T.$_n$ for some n, then $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is also W.I.T.$_{n'}$ for some n', and moreover $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{E}}} = (-1)^*\mathcal{E}$, where (-1) multiplies all coordinates on the torus by -1 [31]. Clearly, those coherent sheaves that are W.I.T.$_n$ for some n have well-behaved dualization properties, and so physicists speaking of Fourier-Mukai transformations usually assume the sheaves in question are all W.I.T. For example, in the examples at the beginning of this section, it was assumed that the coherent sheaves given were W.I.T.$_1$. However, not all coherent sheaves of interest are W.I.T., and for the more general case one needs the more general methods outlined in this paper. We shall speak to the more general case, and the precise relevance of the W.I.T. condition, in a later section.

4.3 Action on Grothendieck groups

Although Fourier-Mukai transforms are defined on derived categories, they factor into an action on Grothendieck groups of coherent sheaves, in a manner that should be suggested by the physical setup of section 3. Let $\alpha_X : D^b_c(X) \to K'_0$ be defined as the map that takes a complex of sheaves into the alternating sum of the cohomologies of the complex, i.e.,

$$\alpha_X : \mathcal{F}^\bullet \to \left[\oplus_n H^{2n}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet)\right] \ominus \left[\oplus_n H^{2n+1}(\mathcal{F}^\bullet)\right]$$

(the same map we introduced in more physical terms in section 3) and let $\mathcal{T} : D^b_c(X) \to D^b_c(\hat{X})$ denote Fourier-Mukai transform, then we have a commutative diagram [34]

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ob } D^b_c(X) & \stackrel{\alpha_X}{\longrightarrow} & K'_0(X) \\ \mathcal{T}\downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{T}_K \\ \text{Ob } D^b_c(\hat{X}) & \stackrel{\alpha_{\hat{X}}}{\longrightarrow} & K'_0(\hat{X}) \end{array}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_K : K'_0(X) \to K'_0(\hat{X})$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}_K(-) \;=\; \sum_i (-)^i R^i\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P}\otimes\pi_1^*-)$$

In other words, the action of Fourier-Mukai transforms on derived categories factors into an action on Grothendieck groups of coherent sheaves.

4.4 A sign ambiguity

The attentive reader will notice there is a minor sign ambiguity in our presentation of Fourier-Mukai transformations. One typically defines the inverse of a Fourier-Mukai transformation with minor sign asymmetries relative to the original transformation [30, section 3.2], just as inverses of Fourier transformations are often defined with relative signs. By contrast, we have presented Fourier-Mukai transformations in an implicitly symmetric fashion, which means our results can only be interpreted physically up to a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ ambiguity.

In order to describe this sign problem more precisely, let us reconsider the two examples given at the beginning of the section, being somewhat more careful about signs.

1) Consider a holomorphic rank N bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on T^2, with $c_1 = 0$ – in other words, an $SU(N)$ bundle on T^2. As mentioned earlier, we assume $\mathcal{E}$ is W.I.T.$_1$, so

$$R^0\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}) \;=\; 0$$

A close examination of our definition of Fourier-Mukai transform reveals that, as an element of $K_0'(\hat{T}^2)$, the Fourier-Mukai transform of $\mathcal{E}$ is not precisely the torsion sheaf $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = R^1\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}\right)$ but rather the virtual torsion sheaf $\ominus\hat{\mathcal{E}} \in K_0'(\hat{T}^2)$.

2) Consider a holomorphic rank N bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on T^4 – in other words, a $U(N)$ bundle on T^4. Assume the complex structure on T^4 is such that the T^4 is projective. Earlier we mentioned that the Fourier-Mukai transform of $\mathcal{E}$ is a bundle $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ on $\hat{T}^4$, in the case that $\mathcal{E}$ is W.I.T.$_1$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} R^0\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}) &= 0 \\ R^2\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

A close examination of our definition of the Fourier-Mukai transform reveals that, as an element of $K_0'(\hat{T}^4)$, the Fourier-Mukai transform of $\mathcal{E}$ is not precisely the bundle $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = R^1\pi_{2*}(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E})$ but rather the virtual bundle $\ominus\hat{\mathcal{E}} \in K_0'(\hat{T}^4)$.

As it has been presented so far, this sign problem could naively be cured by redefining the Fourier-Mukai transform. Unfortunately, the difficulty is much deeper. Consider applying a Fourier-Mukai transform twice. If we are studying branes wrapped on T^{2g}, then this means T-dualizing along each of the $2g$ S^1's in T^{2g} twice, and so intuitively we should return to where we started. According to [31], $\mathcal{T}^2 = (-1)^*[-g]$ as an action on $D^b(T^{2g})$. The $[-g]$ formally shifts all complexes g places to the right, and the (-1) multiplies all complex coordinates on the torus by -1. This descends to an action on the Grothendieck group that, for g odd, switches signs (naively exchanging branes and antibranes), and for g even, leaves the Grothendieck group essentially invariant.

Thus, if we apply Fourier-Mukai transform twice, then we do not get precisely the same element of the Grothendieck group we started with, but rather an element differing by a

sign. Thus, we can clearly identify Fourier-Mukai transforms with T-duality only up to a $\mathbf{Z}_2$. As mentioned earlier, this is not a fundamental difficulty, but merely reflects the fact that we have defined the Fourier-Mukai transform symmetrically with respect to a torus and its dual, rather than with sign asymmetries that are often introduced.

4.5 Non-W.I.T. sheaves

Earlier we gave the definition of W.I.T. sheaves, and noted that for W.I.T. sheaves, Fourier-Mukai transforms simplify greatly – their action becomes well defined on individual W.I.T. sheaves, one does not need the full technology of derived categories and/or Grothendieck groups. In prior physics literature on Fourier-Mukai transforms, all sheaves were typically assumed to be W.I.T., for precisely this reason. Unfortunately, not all the coherent sheaves that one would like to study are W.I.T. – not even all supersymmetric D-brane vacua are W.I.T. – and for the more general case one needs the more sophisticated methods reviewed in this paper. In this section we shall work through an example of a non-W.I.T. sheaf, and speak to the relationship between the W.I.T. condition and Mumford-Takemoto semistability.

First, let us construct an easy explicit example of a non-W.I.T. sheaf. Consider a sheaf $\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{T}$ on T^2, where $\mathcal{E}$ is a W.I.T. rank N bundle of $c_1 = 0$, and $\mathcal{T}$ is a torsion sheaf supported at N' points on T^2. It is easy to check that this sheaf is not W.I.T. As described earlier, the Fourier-Mukai transform of $\mathcal{E}$ is $\ominus\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \ominus R^1\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}\right) \in K_0'(\hat{T}^2)$, and the Fourier-Mukai transform of $\mathcal{T}$ is a rank N' bundle $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ on $\hat{T}^2$. Thus, the Fourier-Mukai transform of the sheaf $\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{T}$ is the virtual sheaf $\hat{\mathcal{T}} \ominus \hat{\mathcal{E}} \in K_0'(\hat{T}^2)$. In other words, the Fourier-Mukai transform of a non-W.I.T. sheaf is not an honest sheaf, but rather some general element of the Grothendieck group of coherent sheaves (or, depending on the reader's preference, the derived category of coherent sheaves) on the dual algebraic torus.

What is the physics buried in the mathematical example above? The coherent sheaf $\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{T}$ cannot be a supersymmetric vacuum configuration – it corresponds to non-dissolved D0-branes inside D2-branes. The Fourier-Mukai transformation takes this non-supersymmetric configuration, involving only branes, to another non-supersymmetric configuration, but (at least naively) involving both branes and antibranes. At first blush it seems very surprising that T-duality could map a configuration of only branes to one involving both branes and antibranes. However, on both sides of the duality we have a nonsupersymmetric configuration, and perhaps more importantly, it is not clear how to distinguish a configuration of D0-branes and D2-antibranes from a configuration of D0- and D2-branes. We shall return to this issue after making a closer examination of the W.I.T. condition.

The reader might well ask, what is the precise relationship between Mumford-Takemoto semistability and the W.I.T. condition? For example, the reader may be tempted to suspect that supersymmetric brane vacua are W.I.T. and so have easy Fourier-Mukai transformations, in other words, that a locally-free sheaf that is Mumford-Takemoto semistable (and

therefore satisfies necessary conditions for a supersymmetric vacuum for a brane) must be W.I.T. Unfortunately this does not seem to be the case in general [35, 36, 37].

Under what circumstances is a torsion-free, Mumford-Takemoto semistable sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ also W.I.T.? First, let us specialize to the case that $\mathcal{E}$ is Mumford-Takemoto stable, not just semistable, and that[13] $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 0$. In this case, $\mathcal{E}$ can have no (holomorphic) sections, as such a section would make $\mathcal{O}$ a subsheaf of the same slope as $\mathcal{E}$, whose existence would contradict Mumford-Takemoto stability. Similarly, if $\mathcal{L}$ is any flat line bundle, then $\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}$ cannot have a section, as the section would define $\mathcal{L}^\vee$ as a subsheaf, and we would have the same contradiction as for $\mathcal{O}$. Thus, for any flat line bundle $\mathcal{L}$, $H^0(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = 0$, and so[14] $R^0\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}\right) = 0$. Now, for any torsion-free sheaf $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}$ is Mumford-Takemoto stable if and only if $\mathcal{E}^\vee$ is also Mumford-Takemoto stable [39, lemma 4.5], consequently by Serre duality we have that on an n-(complex-)dimensional torus, $H^n(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = 0$ for any flat line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ by the same arguments as above, and so $R^n\pi_{2*}\left(\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi_1^*\mathcal{E}\right) = 0$.

Thus, a torsion-free, Mumford-Takemoto stable sheaf on T^4 of $c_1 = 0$ is necessarily W.I.T.$_1$. Unfortunately one does not get such statements in greater generality. For example, on higher-dimensional tori, there is no good reason why a torsion-free, Mumford-Takemoto stable sheaf of $c_1 = 0$ should be W.I.T., and in general we expect that they will not be W.I.T.

So far in our discussion of the relationship between the W.I.T. condition and Mumford-Takemoto stability, we have only spoken about stable sheaves. How would one deal with Mumford-Takemoto semistable sheaves that are not stable? After all, these can also satisfy the conditions for a supersymmetric D-brane vacuum. As noted in [40], when using a properly semistable sheaf, physics sees a split sheaf with stable factors. Thus, questions regarding Fourier-Mukai transforms and W.I.T. conditions for semistable sheaves can be reduced to questions regarding direct sums of stable sheaves.

In general, therefore, there does not seem to be a simple relationship between Mumford-Takemoto stability and the W.I.T. condition. If we follow the usual wisdom that a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of T-duality is identified with Fourier-Mukai transformation, then one consequence is that T-duals of some supersymmetric D-brane vacua naively involve both branes and antibranes.

Some care is required in interpreting Grothendieck group elements, however. A standard example from topological K-theory should make possible subtleties more clear. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a C^∞ vector bundle on a k-dimensional manifold M, then there exists a rank k C^∞ bundle $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{E} = 1 \ominus \mathcal{F}$, where 1 denotes the trivial rank $2k$ bundle [23, exercise 3.3e, p. 39].

[13] It is interesting that W.I.T. and stability of a torsion-free sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ correlate somewhat more naturally when $\det \mathcal{E}$ is trivial; one is tempted to wonder if there is any connection to the fact that overall $U(1)$'s decouple from $U(N)$ in the AdS/CFT correspondence (see, for example, [38]).

[14] In this subsection we shall be slightly sloppy about computing right derived functors. For a more detailed examination of their properties, see for example [22, section III.12].

Ordinarily, following [1], one would assume that $1 \ominus \mathcal{F}$ was necessarily a non-supersymmetric configuration of both branes and antibranes, but here we see that even without tachyon condensation, sometimes a brane/antibrane configuration is equivalent to a configuration of only branes[15].

Thus, even without tachyon condensation, sometimes naively nontrivial elements of topological K-theory, and also Grothendieck groups, are equivalent to trivial elements. We suspect (though we have not proven) that this is what is happening in Fourier-Mukai transformations of non-W.I.T. supersymmetric D-brane vacua – one gets a naively nontrivial element of the Grothendieck group of coherent sheaves, which is subtly equivalent to a configuration involving only branes.

5 Conclusions

In this paper we have argued that it can be useful to consider D-brane charges in terms of Grothendieck groups and, to a lesser extent, derived categories. We began by defining Grothendieck groups and listing some basic properties, then briefly outlined derived categories and displayed a physically natural map from objects of a derived category to a Grothendieck group of coherent sheaves. We concluded with a discussion of T-duality in terms of Fourier-Mukai transforms, and argued that to understand the action of Fourier-Mukai transforms even on general supersymmetric vacua, one needed the technology of Grothendieck groups and derived categories.

Derived categories have previously entered the physics literature through Kontsevich's mirror conjecture [28, 29], in which mirror symmetry was conjectured to be realizable as an equivalence of certain derived categories. It would be interesting to see if any insight could be gained by working instead with Grothendieck groups. Perhaps Grothendieck groups would be more relevant for the open-string mirror symmetry proposed in [41].

Derived categories might conceivably play a role in giving a solid justification to certain proposed analogues of T-duality. For example, in [42], a T-duality symmetry was conjectured that exchanged branes wrapped on general algebraic surfaces. This hypothesized T-duality-analogue might conceivably be justified in terms of an equivalence of derived categories on algebraic surfaces, or even an automorphism of derived categories on a single[16] algebraic

[15] For a simpler example of a brane/antibrane configuration equivalent to a configuration of only branes without tachyon condensation, consider the K-theory element $(\mathcal{E} \oplus \mathcal{F}) \ominus \mathcal{F}$. This is clearly the same as the branes-only configuration $\mathcal{E}$, without tachyon condensation. The example discussed above is merely a more sophisticated version of this case.

[16] In particular, it has been argued [44, 45] that a variety X can be more or less reconstructed from $D^b_c(X)$ if either its canonical sheaf or its anticanonical sheaf is ample, so for some algebraic surfaces, such as del Pezzo surfaces, the only possible T-duality-analogues of the form proposed above would necessarily map the surface into itself.

surface, in which case one would presumably get not a $\mathbf{Z}_2$ subgroup of some continuous family of symmetries, but only a (discrete) $\mathbf{Z}_2$ T-duality-analogue. (A more specialized form of this conjecture, given essentially for algebraic K3s, was stated in [3].) One might even speculate that the existence of equivalences of derived categories of coherent sheaves on distinct Calabi-Yau's [43] might signal the existence of some mirror-symmetry-analogue for branes, analogous to that proposed in [41].

The description of D-branes in terms of K theory given in [1] may also yield interesting new insights via string-string duality. For example, consider the duality relating IIA compactified on $K3$ to a heterotic string on T^4. A D2-brane wrapped on a curve in $K3$, for example, is interpreted as a particle on the heterotic side. What is the heterotic interpretation of a wrapped D2 brane/antibrane pair? Presumably the heterotic dual to such a configuration is a massive heterotic string state [10]. Thus, the interpretation of D-branes in terms of K theory may give rise to a new geometric interpretation of massive heterotic states, for example.

It is somewhat tempting to speculate that massive heterotic string states may have, at least sometimes, an interpretation in terms of topological K theory or Grothendieck groups of the space that the heterotic string is compactified on. In such an event, it would seem likely that isomorphisms of derived categories on distinct Calabi-Yau's [43] may correspond immediately to some limit of (0,2) mirror symmetry, in which all B-fields are turned off and α' is small.

6 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank P. Aspinwall, T. Gomez, K. Hori, P. Horja, A. Knutson, D. Morrison, B. Pardon, R. Plesser, M. Stern, and E. Witten for useful conversations.

A Notes on topological K-theory

For more information on topological K-theory, see for example [21, 23, 46, 47].

Given a compact complex manifold X, the group $K(X)$ is the free abelian group on isomorphism classes of complex vector bundles on X, modulo elements of the form $[\mathcal{E}_0 \oplus \mathcal{E}_1] - [\mathcal{E}_0] - [\mathcal{E}_1]$, where $\mathcal{E}_0$, $\mathcal{E}_1$ are complex vector bundles on X and $[\mathcal{E}]$ denotes the isomorphism class of $\mathcal{E}$. Put another way, elements of $K(X)$ are "virtual bundles" of the form $\mathcal{E} \ominus \mathcal{F}$. More generally, it is straightforward to see that K defines a contravariant functor from the category of compact spaces to the category of abelian groups.

What is $K(\text{point})$? A vector bundle on a point is completely determined by its rank, so it should be clear that $K(\text{point}) \cong \mathbf{Z}$.

The reduced K-ring of X, denoted $\tilde{K}(X)$, is defined to be the kernel of the natural projection $K(X) \to K(\text{point})$.

Let X be a topological space, Y some subset of X. There exists a notion of relative K-theory, denoted $K(X,Y)$, which is defined as $K(X,Y) = \tilde{K}(X/Y)$. (If Y is a closed subset of X, then X/Y is essentially a space obtained by collapsing Y down to a single point. For more information see for example [48, section 0.2].) As the reader may well guess, $K(X,\emptyset) = K(X)$.

Define the suspension of a topological space X, denoted SX, to be the quotient of $X \times I$ (where $I = [0,1]$, the unit interval) obtained by collapsing $X \times \{0\}$ to one point and $X \times \{1\}$ to another point. For example, $SS^n = S^{n+1}$.

For n positive, define $K^{-n}(X/Y) = \tilde{K}(S^n(X/Y))$. In particular, $K^{-1}(\text{point}) = 0$.

Bott periodicity is simply the statement that for any compact Hausdorff space X, $K^n(X) \cong K^{n+2}(X)$. Similarly, $K^n(X/Y) \cong K^{n+2}(X/Y)$.

We defined K^n above for n negative only; however, by Bott periodicity we can now define K^n for arbitary integer n:

$$\begin{aligned} K^n(X) &= K^0(X) \text{ for n even} \\ K^n(X) &= K^{-1}(X) \text{ for n odd} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $K^n(X,Y)$, and so forth.

$K^1(X)$ has an alternative definition, described in [46, section II.3]. Consider the category whose objects are pairs $(\mathcal{E},\alpha)$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is a bundle and $\alpha : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism, and whose morphisms $(\mathcal{E},\alpha) \to (\mathcal{E}',\alpha')$ are given by maps $h : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}'$ such that the following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \mathcal{E} \\ h\downarrow & & \downarrow h \\ \mathcal{E}' & \xrightarrow{\alpha'} & \mathcal{E}' \end{array}$$

Define the sum of two objects $(\mathcal{E},\alpha)$ and $(\mathcal{E}',\alpha')$ to be $(\mathcal{E}\oplus\mathcal{E}', \alpha\oplus\alpha')$. Define a pair $(\mathcal{E},\alpha)$ to be elementary if α is homotopic to the identity within automorphisms of $\mathcal{E}$. Now we finally have the definitions in hand to define $K^1(X)$. Define $K^1(X)$ to be the free abelian group on objects in the category, modulo the equivalence relation $(\mathcal{E},\alpha) \sim (\mathcal{E}',\alpha')$ if and only if there exist elementary pairs $(\mathcal{F},\beta)$ and $(\mathcal{F}',\beta')$ such that $(\mathcal{E},\alpha) + (\mathcal{F},\beta) \cong (\mathcal{E}',\alpha') + (\mathcal{F}',\beta')$.

For notational purposes, let $[\mathcal{E},\alpha]$ denote the equivalence class of the pair $(\mathcal{E},\alpha)$ in $K^1(X)$. Then it can be shown that $[\mathcal{E},\alpha\circ\beta] = [\mathcal{E},\alpha] + [\mathcal{E},\beta]$.

It is possible to define a product on elements of K theory; it has the properties

$$\begin{aligned} K^0(X) \cdot K^0(X) &\subseteq K^0(X) \\ K^0(X) \cdot K^1(X) &\subseteq K^1(X) \\ K^1(X) \cdot K^1(X) &\subseteq K^0(X) \end{aligned}$$

By this point the reader has no doubt noticed the similarity between the groups $K^n(X)$ and $H^n(X)$. In fact, K theory is an example of a "generalized" cohomology theory. More precisely, cohomology theories can be defined axiomatically [49], and K theory satisfies all the axioms for a cohomology theory except one (the dimension axiom).

References

[1] E. Witten, "D-branes and K theory," `hep-th/9810188`.

[2] J. Harvey and G. Moore, "On the algebras of BPS states," Comm. Math. Phys. **197** (1998) 489-519, `hep-th/9609017`.

[3] K. Hori and Y. Oz, "F-theory, T-duality on K3 surfaces and $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric gauge theories in four dimensions," Nucl. Phys. **B501** (1997) 97-108, `hep-th/9702173`.

[4] H. B. Lawson, Jr. and M.-L. Michelsohn, *Spin Geometry*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1989.

[5] R. L. Bryant and E. Sharpe, "D-branes and Spin^c structures," `hep-th/9812084`.

[6] P. Hořava, "Type IIA D-branes, K theory, and matrix theory," `hep-th/9812135`.

[7] H. Garcia-Compean, "D-branes in orbifold singularities and equivariant K theory," `hep-th/9812226`.

[8] S. Gukov, "K theory, reality, and orientifolds," `hep-th/9901042`.

[9] P. Yi, "Membranes from five-branes and fundamental strings from Dp-branes," `hep-th/9901159`.

[10] O. Bergman and M. R. Gaberdiel, "NonBPS states in Heterotic Type IIA duality," `hep-th/9901014`.

[11] A. Sen, 'Stable non-BPS states in string theory," JHEP 9806 (1998) 007, `hep-th/9803194`.

[12] A. Sen, "Stable non-BPS bound states of BPS D-branes," JHEP 9808 (1998) 010, `hep-th/9805019`.

[13] A. Sen, "Tachyon condensation on the brane antibrane system," JHEP 9808 (1998) 012, hep-th/9805170.

[14] A. Sen, "BPS D-branes on nonsupersymmetric cycles," hep-th/9812031.

[15] R. Minasian and G. Moore, "K-theory and Ramond-Ramond charges," JHEP 9711 (1997) 002, hep-th/9710230.

[16] O. Bergman, E. Gimon, and P. Hořava, in preparation.

[17] K. Hori, "D-branes, T-duality, and index theory," hep-th/9902102.

[18] S. Kobayashi, *Differential Geometry of Complex Vector Bundles*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1987.

[19] Yu. I. Manin, "Lectures on the K-functor in algebraic geometry," Russ. Math. Surveys **24** (1969) 1-89.

[20] P. Berthelot, A. Grothendieck, and L. Illusie, *Théorie des Intersections et Théorème de Riemann-Roch*, SGA 6, Lecture Notes in Math. 225, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.

[21] M. F. Atiyah and F. Hirzebruch, "Vector bundles and homogeneous spaces," in *Differential Geometry*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **3**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1961.

[22] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.

[23] D. Husemoller, *Fibre Bundles*, third edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[24] R. G. Swan, *Algebraic K-Theory*, Lecture Notes in Math. 76, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1968.

[25] C. Weibel, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[26] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and Duality*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[27] P. Aspinwall and R. Donagi, "The heterotic string, the tangent bundle, and derived categories," hep-th/9806094.

[28] A. Polishchuk and E. Zaslow, "Categorical mirror symmetry: the elliptic curve," math.AG/9801119.

[29] M. Kontsevich, "Homological algebra of mirror symmetry," Proceedings of the 1994 International Congress of Mathematicians, Birkäuser, Zürich, 1995, p. 120, alg-geom/9411018.

[30] S. K. Donaldson and P. B. Kronheimer, *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1990.

[31] S. Mukai, "Duality between $D(X)$ and $D(\hat{X})$ with its application to Picard sheaves," Nagoya Math. J. **81** (1981) 153-175.

[32] D. Orlov, "Equivalences of derived categories and K3 surfaces," J. Math. Sci. (New York) **84** (1997) 1361-1381, `alg-geom/9606006`.

[33] T. Bridgeland, "Equivalences of triangulated categories and Fourier-Mukai transforms," Bull. London Math. Soc. **31** (1999) 25-34, `math.AG/9809114`.

[34] A. Beauville, "Quelques remarques sur la transformation de Fourier dans l'anneau de Chow d'une variété abélienne," in *Algebraic Geometry*, ed. by A. Dold and B. Eckmann, Lecture Notes in Math. 1016, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.

[35] D. Huybrechts, private communication.

[36] A. Maciocia, private communication.

[37] R. Thomas, private communication.

[38] O. Aharony and E. Witten, "Anti-de-Sitter space and the center of the gauge group," JHEP 9811 (1998) 018, `hep-th/9807205`.

[39] R. Friedman, *Algebraic Surfaces and Holomorphic Vector Bundles*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[40] E. Sharpe, "Kähler cone substructure," `hep-th/9810064`.

[41] C. Vafa, "Extending mirror conjecture to Calabi-Yau with bundles," `hep-th/9804131`.

[42] M. Bershadsky, A. Johansen, T. Pantev, V. Sadov, and C. Vafa, "F-theory, geometric engineering and N=1 dualities," Nucl. Phys. **B505** (1997) 153-164, `hep-th/9612052`.

[43] A. Maciocia, "Generalized Fourier-Mukai transforms," J. Riene Angew. Math. **480** (1996) 197-211, `alg-geom/9705001`.

[44] A. Bondal and D. Orlov, "Semiorthogonal decompositions for algebraic varieties," `alg-geom/9506012`.

[45] A. Bondal and D. Orlov, "Reconstruction of a variety from the derived category and groups of autoequivalences," `alg-geom/9712029`.

[46] M. Karoubi, *K-Theory: An Introduction*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1978.

[47] M. Atiyah, *K-Theory*, W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1967.

[48] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology I*, available on the web at `http://math.cornell.edu/~hatcher`.

[49] S. Eilenberg and N. Steenrod, *Foundations of Algebraic Topology*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1952.